

> US Rep. Wexler Blasts DOJ at Enforcement Hearing

> by Emily Swoboda

>

> The House Committee on the Judiciary heard testimony today on the effectiveness of the enforcement of the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act, but the Department of Justice's prosecution methods and the U.S. trade dispute with Antigua stood out as highlights of the hearing.

>

> Catherine Hanaway, U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, was there to testify on behalf of the DOJ, but spent more time defending its perhaps questionable position on Internet gambling. She said the DOJ considers all forms of Internet gambling illegal and will continue prosecutions.

>

> "Internet gambling poses unacceptable risk due to the potential for gambling by minors and compulsive gambling," she testified.

- >
- > Hanaway said Internet gambling carries with it the potential for fraud, money laundering and the involvement of organized crime.
- >
- > She conceded, however, that no case of online gambling-related money laundering has been proven.
- >
- > She said the government has ample authority to make cases against law-breakers without the UIGEA, but wouldn't recommend doing away with it.
- >
- > Rep. Robert Wexler, D-Fl., questioned why the DOJ has taken to practicing selective prosecution when it comes to Internet gambling.
- >
- > "As I understand it, we don't prohibit horse wagering on the Internet, yet you testify that it's the Department of Justice's position that all forms of Internet gambling are prohibited," Wexler asked Hanaway. "If that's the case, why aren't we prosecuting every lottery director in America? Why aren't we prosecuting everybody who shows up at every off track horse betting establishment in America? Why aren't we prosecuting every fantasy sports outlet in America? Where am I getting this wrong?"
- >
- > Hanaway said that the DOJ does take the position that online horse wagering is illegal and has prosecuted cases under the Wire Act.
- >
- > "Has the Department of Justice shut down a single e-lottery system in the United States, and if you haven't, why not?" Wexler asked Hanaway.
- >
- > Hanaway did not know the answer to Wexler's question, but offered to find out and submit it in writing.
- >
- > "The beauty of the Department of Justice's position as you enunciate it, which is 'all forms of Internet gambling are prohibited,' means there's no grey area: shut it all down," Wexler said. "So, when we see selective enforcement that's what suggests a very untoward result in some of our minds."
- >
- > The committee heard arguments on states' rights. Many states have legalized online gambling activities such as lotteries and horse racing. The legalization of these activities, but the prohibition of others led to the nearly five-year World Trade Organization dispute between the United States and the twin-island nation of Antigua and Barbuda over the United States' selective attitude toward online gambling.
- >
- > Professor Joseph Weiler of the New York University School of Law is an expert on international law. He said that while the WTO does not oblige the United States to have legal remote gambling, it does not allow it to pick and choose which activities to legalize.
- >
- > He added that there is no question that the U.S. ban on Internet gambling is a violation of its WTO commitments.
- >
- > The ongoing dispute has resulted in three rulings against the United States at the WTO. Each ruling has ordered the United States to bring its laws into compliance with international trade laws under the WTO and the General Agreement on Trade in Services, which was signed in 1995. But, rather than comply with the rulings, the U.S. government has chosen to withdraw gambling services from its GATS commitments.
- >

> "Our country is the trendsetter and leader in so many international arenas," Weiler said. "Whether we like it or not, we lead by example. This is not a good example."

>

> An industry insider with knowledge of the situation felt that Weiler's testimony had the most impact on the hearing as it demonstrated the implications of the WTO situation on not only the United States but the Internet gambling industry.

>

> "Joseph Weiler's commentary was dramatic and far-reaching and it has implications for the industry across the globe," the insider said. "He really dominated the hearing with what he had to say. Everyone else had more of the same, but he put a new spin on the whole conundrum of legalizing online gambling and allowing free access to the online gambling market in the United States."

>

> Jeffrey Sandman, spokesman for the Safe and Secure Internet Gambling Initiative, which promotes the Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act (H.R. 2046), said the hearing clearly demonstrated Congress' need to reverse its current policies on Internet gambling.

>

> "Instead of prohibiting Internet gambling, which is futile and denies Americans the freedom to decide whether to gamble online, the government should regulate and tax Internet gambling," Sandman said. "Regulated Internet gambling would ensure proven and effective security controls are available to protect consumers and capture billions in revenue that is needed for critical government programs."

>

> Other witnesses included Valerie Abend, deputy assistant secretary for the U.S. Treasury, who testified on the long-overdue draft regulations for the UIGEA, which were just published on Oct. 1.

>

> A public comment period on the proposed rule is scheduled to close Dec. 12, and Abend said the U.S. Treasury is expecting a large number of responses and would have to provide analysis and reasons for any decisions based on the comments received.

>

> She did concede that the regulations would have no way of policing transactions through offshore bank accounts.

>

> Abend could not say when the regulations would be complete and enforceable, but it has been said that it would be an additional six months after completion of the public comment period.

>

> The committee also heard from Rep. Shelley Berkley, D-Nev., who has introduced the Internet Gaming Study Act; Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., a long-time opponent of Internet gambling; Tom McClusky, VP of the Family Research Council; professional poker player Annie Duke; and Michael Colopy from Aristotle.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Professor Joseph Weiler.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Rep. Bob Goodlatte.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Rep. Shelley Berkley.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Catherine Hanaway.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of the Safe and Secure Internet Gambling Initiative.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Michael Colopy.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Annie Duke.

>

> Click here to read the full testimony of Valerie Abend.

>

> Like this article? Subscribe to IGamingNews.com for more content like this as well as breaking news bulletins, editorials, desktop conferences, a vast research library and much more.

>

[Reply](#)

[Reply All](#)

[Forward](#)

[Delete](#)

[Move message to...](#)

[Next](#) | [INBOX](#)

Copyright © [Everyone.net\(TM\)](#) All Rights Reserved. [Terms of Service](#). [Privacy Policy](#).

> Lawmakers Want Ban on Internet Gambling Removed

> (Reuters) - The Bush administration should explore legislation to roll back a U.S. ban on Internet gambling instead of paying compensation to the European Union and other trading partners, the chairmen of two House of Representatives committees said on Monday.

>

> House Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank, House Judiciary Committee Chairman John Conyers and six other lawmakers criticized the Bush administration's handling of the issue in a letter to U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab.

>

> "Your agency has chosen not to consult with Congress, but instead to take what we view as a drastic step which could have significant consequences for the whole WTO (World Trade Organization) system," the lawmakers said.

>

> Rather than comply with a negative WTO ruling in a case filed by the Caribbean nation Antigua and Barbuda, the United States announced earlier this year it was "clarifying" it never intended to allow foreign firms to offer Internet gambling services as part of the 1994 Uruguay Round trade pact.

>

> That opened the door for other trading partners to demand compensation for the United States'

decision to retroactively exclude Internet gambling from its commitments under the General Agreement on Trade in Services, or GATS.

>

> The United States has been in negotiation with the EU, India, Japan, Costa Rica, Macao, Canada and Australia on a compensation package and the trading partners recently set a new mid-December deadline for reaching a deal.

>

> The compensation would require the United States to open other service markets, such as insurance, to more foreign firms.

>

> Meanwhile, Antigua is pressing the WTO for permission to slap \$3.4 billion in "cross retaliation" on the United States by suspending copyright protections on American movies, music and software.

>

> 'U.S. CREDIBILITY' AT STAKE, LAWMAKERS SAY

>

> Congress passed legislation last year banning most Internet gambling by making it illegal for banks and credit card companies to make payments to online gambling sites.

>

> Frank has offered legislation to roll back the ban, while Conyers warned during a Judiciary Committee hearing last week that the ban could hurt U.S. foreign relations.

>

> "Continuing with the same old failed policies for the sake of feel-good politics doesn't make sense," Conyers said.

>

>

> In the letter to Schwab, the lawmakers said they feared compensation would be "expensive to the U.S. economy. However, we are perhaps more concerned about what this withdrawal says about U.S. credibility as a trading partner."

>

> It also could backfire by encouraging other countries to withdraw commitments that turn out to be "inconvenient or politically difficult," they said.

>

> In past cases, the Bush administration has often worked with Congress to comply with adverse WTO rulings.

>

> "We are writing to express our interest in considering possible legislative solutions that might restore U.S. compliance with the GATS agreement without renouncing any of our commitments under that agreement," the lawmakers said.

>

> Filed Under: Online Gambling News

>

> ---

>

> Reuters

>

> Originally published November 19, 2007 8:55 am ET

>

>

>

Reply

Reply All

Forward

Delete

Move message to...

[Previous](#) | [Next](#) | [INBOX](#)

Copyright © [Everyone.net\(TM\)](#) All Rights Reserved. [Terms of Service](#). [Privacy Policy](#).

Online gaming law could scuttle Kentucky Derby betting  
By Halimah Abdullah | McClatchy Newspapers

WASHINGTON — Some horse racing fans looking to place online bets for the 134th Kentucky Derby this weekend may find their transactions blocked by banks and credit card companies trying to avoid running afoul of unclear federal regulations, gaming and banking industry experts said Thursday.

**"Unless the government takes the responsibility of telling the banks which merchants they shouldn't deal with,** (Rich, think about what you just read... The banks want the GOV to tell them who they can do business with, i.e. who has GOV protection! Also, what would that decision be based on? When a bettor opens an account with a book, the bank, processor or gateway has no way of knowing what type of event the bettor is going



to wager on... Virtually every online book offers horse racing, does that mean that as long as the funds are applied to horse racing only, the bet is legal and it is ok to deal with an offshore book?) and when banks take the position that they are not going to process these transactions without guidance, all heck will break loose," said Tony Cabot, an attorney with the Las Vegas firm Lewis and Roca, which represents the Nevada Pari-Mutuel Association.

Advocates for the banking and online gambling industries, legal scholars and several members of Congress are pushing the U.S. Treasury, the Federal Reserve and the Justice Department to clarify whether a regulatory exemption in the Unlawful Internet Gaming Enforcement Act that allows Internet gambling on horse racing could also mean that banks and credit card companies would be penalized for processing the money from those wagers.

**Under the law, passed in 2006 as part of the SAFE Port Security Act, the nation's banks and credit card companies are prohibited from accepting payments for some online bets or wagers. However, the financial institutions are largely left to figure out which gambling transactions are illegal and block payments.**

Financial institutions say this unfairly puts them in the position of trying to decide what's legal with little clear guidance from the federal agencies responsible for implementing the rule.

Until the federal agencies issue better guidance, some financial service companies may refuse to handle any online gambling transactions, said Nelson Rose, a law professor at Whittier College in Costa Mesa, Calif., and the author of several books on gaming law. **At stake is millions of dollars in online gaming revenue and hefty legal penalties for banks that processed online gaming transactions that are later found to be illegal.**

"The problem is that in some states online gambling is legal, in others it is not and in still other cases the question depends on where the bettor is, where the gaming operator is and what form of gambling is taking place," Rose said.

Last fall, in response to growing concern, the agencies solicited public response to proposed regulatory changes. They received more than 200 comments and are culling through the responses, said Jennifer Zuccarelli, a spokeswoman with the Treasury Department.

**In the meantime, members of Congress who weighed in last month during a House Financial Services subcommittee hearing were sharply critical of the law, which they called vague and costly for financial institutions to implement. One of the most common complaints is that the rules fail to sufficiently define key terms, leaving financial institutions to figure out how to comply, said Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-III.**

"For example, the regulation fails to adequately define what constitutes 'unlawful Internet gambling' or 'restricted transaction,' yet requires the financial institutions to make a determination on their own about what is

lawful or unlawful," Gutierrez said.

House Financial Services Committee Chairman Barney Frank, D-Mass., and senior committee member Rep. Ron Paul, R-Texas, have introduced legislation designed to prohibit the federal government from issuing regulations called for in the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006.

**House Judiciary Committee Chairman John Conyers, D-Mich., and Rep. Chris Cannon, R-Utah, took former Attorney General Alberto Gonzales to task in a letter last year for the law's ambiguity on which states should block online horse gambling transactions.** In response, Deputy Assistant Attorney General Brian Benczkowski said then and the Department of Justice has since reiterated that "while the UIGEA requires that the regulations be issued 'in consultation with the attorney general,' the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve have the primary responsibility for drafting the regulations, and therefore we would defer questions concerning the timing or the scope of the regulations to those parties."

[Reply](#)[Reply All](#)[Forward](#)[Delete](#)[Move message to...](#)[Previous](#) | [Next](#) | [INBOX](#)

Copyright © [Everyone.net\(TM\)](#) All Rights Reserved. [Terms of Service](#). [Privacy Policy](#).

**Cheema (2)**

Colton

goldman

UIGEA 'Burden without Benefit?' Hearing Set for April 2  
by IGN Staff

**harvey (1)**

hunsaker

**jellinsky (1)**

Six months ago, the proposed regulations for the UIGEA were released -- next week, U.S. lawmakers and a select group of witnesses will meet to review the rules in a hearing transparently titled "Proposed UIGEA Regulations: Burden without Benefit?"

keith kelly

krapchan

moscow

The hearing is scheduled for April 2, and will be held by the House Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade and Technology (SMPTT).

**orders (1)**

Pacific La...

SMPTT members include Florida Democrat Robert Wexler -- who was outspokenly critical during November's UIGEA enforcement hearing -- and Ron Paul, R-Texas, who considers a federal ban on Internet gambling unconstitutional.

paschini

resistance

Witnesses have yet to be announced.

riek

ruan

Between October and December, the proposed rules drew over 200 responses from various banks, gamblers, church groups and members of Congress.

Taish

telephone ...

Parent committee to SMPTT is the House Financial Services Committee, chaired by Barney Frank, D-Mass.

thorne

**tickets (1)**

Manage folders

Like this article? Subscribe to IGamingNews.com for more content like this as well as breaking news bulletins, editorials, desktop conferences, a vast research library and much more.

Add an e-mail  
account

Today

Mail

Contacts

Calendar

Have a fast connection and want more features? Try the full version to see message previews in your inbox. (It's free, too.)

© 2008 Microsoft | Privacy | Legal

Help Central | Account | Feedback

#2008-7 © Copyright 2008, all rights reserved worldwide. Gambling and the Law® is a registered trademark of Professor I Nelson Rose, [www.GAMBLINGANDTHELAW.com](http://www.GAMBLINGANDTHELAW.com)

## Gambling and the Law®: An Attempt To Gut The UIGEA

On April 10, 2008, a Congressional odd couple introduced a bill that would eviscerate the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act ("UIGEA").

Democrat Barney Frank, the first openly gay member of Congress, from Massachusetts, the most liberal and Democratic state, was joined by Ron Paul, from Texas, candidate for the Republican nomination for President. The two are actually not that far apart. They are both libertarians, who believe government should not be messing with individuals' private affairs.

Their bill, H.R. 5767, is short but to the point:

"The Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, whether acting jointly or separately, may not propose, prescribe, or implement any regulation" under the UIGEA, "including the proposed regulations published in the Federal Register on October 4, 2007."

This would effectively eliminate the legal, if not the practical, impact of the UIGEA. The UIGEA does only two things:

- 1) It creates a new crime, that of being a gambling business that accepts money for illegal transactions, and
- 2) It tells Treasury and the Federal Reserve ("the Agencies") to make regulations requiring

financial institutions to identify and block transmissions of money for illegal online gambling.

The first, the new crime, is almost meaningless, since it only applies to Internet operators who are already breaking other federal or state laws. Now, the Frank-Paul bill would eliminate the second, because the Agencies would be barred from issuing any regulations.

Note the specific reference to the October 4, 2007 proposed regs. The Agencies looked at the UIGEA and decided that it was too complicated for the federal government to determine whether transactions were unlawful. So, it put the burden on the banks and credit card companies.

On April 2, 2008, Frank chaired a hearing titled: "Proposed UIGEA Regulations: Burden Without Benefit?" Witness after witness joined the 217 written comments that had been submitted earlier in blasting the proposed regs as unworkable.

Many testified along the lines of, "How do you expect a bank employee to know when a transmission of funds is for illegal gambling, when even the federal government says it does not have the resources to know when an online bet is illegal?"

Banks don't care about protecting their customers' right to gambling. But they are very concerned that they could be hit by big fines if they let through a transmission that the government later says they should have blocked.

And banks are mostly concerned with the cost. They called it "an unfunded

mandate," meaning the federal government was requiring them to do something "that will cost the banks billions of dollars" without being reimbursed.

Do Frank and Paul think their bill will become law? Possibly. But the purpose may have been to tell the Agencies that a lot of people are unhappy with the proposed regs. The goal may be to slow things down until after the election. With a new President and Congress, the UIGEA could be undone, or at least amended.

Could the Frank-Paul bill pass? Frank has the powerful position of Chair of the House Financial Services Committee and Paul is a senior member. Online gamblers have very little influence. But banks are powerful political players. And no one, aside from the religious far right, is in favor of the UIGEA.

If it does pass Congress, Pres. George W. Bush is unlikely to veto it. Why would he want to get into a political fight with banks over a complicated issue that he does not care about?

END

© Copyright 2008. Professor I Nelson Rose is recognized as one of the world's leading experts on gambling law. His latest books, INTERNET GAMING LAW and GAMING LAW: CASES AND MATERIALS, are available through his website, [www.GAMBLINGANDTHELAW.com](http://www.GAMBLINGANDTHELAW.com).

billock  
 carson (2)  
 Chapin  
 Cheema (2)  
 Colton  
 goldman  
 harvey (1)  
 hunsaker  
 jellinsky (1)  
 keith kelly  
 krapchan  
 moscow  
 orders (1)  
 Pacific La...  
 paschini  
 resistance  
 rieck  
 ruan  
 Taish  
 telephone ...  
 thorne  
 tickets (1)  
 Manage folders  
 Add an e-mail  
 account  
 Today  
 Mail  
 Contacts  
 Calendar

**Lawmakers: Treasury Should Not Waste Time on Online Gambling**  
 A bipartisan group of House Financial Services Committee members have warned U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve officials not to waste any more time trying to implement a ban on online gambling.  
 Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.), the chairman of the panel, along with Reps. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), Ron Paul (R-Texas) and Pete King (R-N.Y.), sent a letter Tuesday to Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke telling them to hold off on writing new regulations based on the law governing Internet gambling, which was approved by the Republican-majority Congress in 2006.  
 The lawmakers, who said they are determined to overturn the law, highlighted issues they said are more important priorities for the nation's financial institutions, such as the home mortgage crisis.  
 "We believe it would be imprudent for you to devote additional agency resources to this Sisyphean task, especially as we intend to vigorously pursue legislation to prevent the implementation of these regulations," the members said.  
 The 2006 law fails to define the term "unlawful Internet gambling," leaving it up to banks and financial institutions to reconcile the conflicting state and federal laws and court decisions when determining whether to process a transaction, the members wrote. Some of the information needed to make the determination could be unavailable to banks because customers or financial institutions in foreign countries may be unlikely to provide it.  
 The letter follows a Financial Services Committee hearing early this month at which Treasury and Federal Reserve officials described the regulations implementing an online gambling ban as vague, confusing and burdensome.  
 Frank and Paul have introduced legislation that would prohibit the implementation of the law's regulations.  
 The letter was sent the same day the Poker Players Alliance announced that its membership had reached 1 million. The group also announced the launch of a voter registration program and a political action committee.

----

Have a fast connection and want more features? Try the full version to see message previews in your inbox. (It's free, too.)

© 2008 Microsoft | Privacy | Legal

Help Central | Account | Feedback

**EXHIBIT "B"** 0015

>  
> HR 6663 Not Welcome by Online Gambling Community  
> Submitted by C Costigan on Mon, 08/04/2008 - 00:00.  
>  
>  
> HR 6663 is an attempt to clarify the Unlawful Internet Gaming  
> Enforcement Act by attempting to clarify the vague language of the  
> UIGEA. Its sole purpose appears to take aim at the sports betting sector.  
>  
> Congressman Pete Sessions, a Republican from Texas, introduced HR 6663  
> this past week without much fanfare.  
>  
> "No provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be  
> construed as clarifying or implying that Internet bets or wagers, other



> than sports bets or wagers, which were accepted subsequent to October  
> 13, 2006, are in violation of Federal law."  
>  
> Needless-to-say, the sports betting community will not be supporting HR  
> 6663 any time soon, nor will the Poker Players Alliance according to a  
> report filed by PocketFives.com  
>  
> PPA Chairman Alfonse D'Amato commented in a press release, "While we  
> agree with several findings in the bill that correctly identify the  
> illegality of sports wagering, the PPA remains concerned with the  
> implication H.R. 6663 asserts in that the Unlawful Internet Gambling  
> Enforcement Act (UIGEA) has made Internet poker an unlawful activity  
> that needs special protection from prosecution." Executive Director John  
> Pappas characterized the PPA's stance as "not explicitly endorsing" HR 6663.  
>  
> The sports betting community - with its base primarily in Costa Rica -  
> has been fighting in the courts - not in Congress - through their  
> overwhelming (and some would say quiet) support of iMEGA.org (see  
> website here) iMEGA is looking to have the UIGEA deemed  
> "unconstitutional" and is following a similar game plan to that of the  
> porno industry, which has successfully taken on Government "intrusion"  
> in recent years.  
>  
> Joe Brennan, Jr., founder of iMEGA.org, was not immediately available  
> for comment at press time late Sunday night.  
>  
> -----

[Reply](#)[Reply All](#)[Forward](#)[Delete](#)[Move message to...](#)[Next](#) | [INBOX](#)

Copyright © [Everyone.net\(TM\)](#) All Rights Reserved. [Terms of Service](#). [Privacy Policy](#).

Colton  
goldman  
harvey (1)  
hunsaker  
jellinsky (1)  
keith kelly  
krapchan  
moscow  
orders (1)  
Pacific La...  
paschini  
resistance  
riek  
ruan  
Taish  
telephone ...  
thorne  
tickets (1)  
Manage folders  
Add an e-mail  
account  
Today  
Mail  
Contacts  
Calendar

WASHINGTON, Aug 7 (Reuters) - Two U.S. lawmakers have urged the U.S. Justice Department to suspend its investigation of European Internet gambling companies for possible criminal violations that occurred before Congress passed a law in 2006 to crack down on online gambling.

Rep. Robert Wexler, a Florida Democrat, and Rep. Steve Cohen, a Tennessee Democrat, warned U.S. Attorney General Michael Mukasey in separate letters the issue could lead to a potentially damaging trade spat between the United States and the European Union at the World Trade Organization.

"In all likelihood, this issue will escalate and I understand could result in WTO action focused specifically on how the U.S. government enforces its laws. I cannot see how that can be in the interests of this country," Wexler said in a letter to Mukasey on Wednesday.

European Internet gambling companies lost billions of euros in market value after Congress moved to shut down the U.S. market by making it illegal for banks and credit card companies to make payments to online gambling sites.

Many publicly traded European companies, such as PartyGaming(PRTY.L: Quote, Profile, Research) and 888.com (888.L: Quote, Profile, Research), withdrew from the United States after Congress passed the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act in 2006, but have continued to face possible criminal prosecution for activities before then.

That prompted the European Commission to launch a formal investigation in March into whether Washington was singling out EU companies for enforcement actions, while allowing U.S. online firms to operate freely.

Cohen, in a July 29 letter to Mukasey, said the Justice Department still had not given a good reason why it was investigating "foreign operators who respected congressional intent in 2006 and withdrew from the market, while U.S. companies continue to operate uninterrupted."

EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson urged the Bush administration in June to "freeze" any Justice Department action until the EU had completed its probe.

An EU team plans to visit Washington in September as part of its investigation. An earlier scheduled visit in July was delayed at the United States' request.

Have a fast connection and want more features? Try the full version to see message previews in your inbox. (It's free, too.)

© 2008 Microsoft | Privacy | Legal

Help Central | Account | Feedback

- > House Committee on Financial Services Chairman Barney Frank (D-Mass.) on
- > Thursday proposed yet another measure that would look to repeal a law
- > making most forms of online gambling illegal.
- >
- > The Unlawful Internet Gaming Enforcement Act (UIGEA) requires that
- > financial institutions monitor transactions related to online gambling,
- > however, not all forms of the activity are illegal and the UIGEA is
- > quite ambiguous when it comes to defining what is and what is not legal.
- >
- > The Payments System Protection Act of 2008, introduced by Congressman
- > Frank on Thursday, would direct the Department of the Treasury and
- > Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the Attorney General, to
- > create a formal process to define what types of online gambling are
- > unlawful to make it possible for the U.S. financial services industry to
- > comply with the current ban on Internet gambling, as required by the
- > Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006, or UIGEA.
- >
- > Chairman Frank is doing the right thing by saying it is unfair to burden
- > U.S. financial service companies with the job of the Internet gambling
- > police at a time when their undivided attention ought to be on the
- > economy," said Jeffrey Sandman, spokesperson for the Safe and Secure
- > Internet Gambling Initiative. "The reality is that UIGEA is dangerous to
- > the payments system and unlikely to stop anyone from using the Internet
- > to play poker, bet on horses, or engage in other types of wagering."
- >
- > Earlier this year, Reps. Frank and Ron Paul (R-Tex.) introduced the
- > first version of the Payments System Protection Act (H.R. 5767), which
- > attempted to stop the U.S. government from taking any further steps in
- > developing regulations to implement UIGEA. Ultimately, the bill, along
- > with an amendment offered by Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), was defeated in

- > the House Committee on Financial Services.
- >
- > Frank told his colleagues that Congress is putting the U.S. financial
- > services industry at risk by not clarifying the regulations to enforce
- > UIGEA and defining unlawful Internet gambling activities. "Hijacking the
- > financial payment system at a time when it is under major stress and
- > giving them the job of carrying out an unclear mandate doesn't make
- > sense," he said.
- >
- > Representatives of the U.S. financial services industry, including the
- > Chamber of Commerce, The Financial Services Roundtable, Credit Union
- > National Association, and National Association of Federal Credit Unions,
- > pledged their support of the original version of the Payments System
- > Protection Act and King amendment in letters to Rep. Frank and members
- > of the Financial Services Committee.
- >
- > "I wish to be clear that we do not support the notion that financial
- > services companies should be 'deputized' to police gambling activity in
- > any form or function," wrote Mr. Steve Barlett, president and CEO of The
- > Financial Services Roundtable on June 23, 2008. "While we would support
- > the passage of H.R. 5767 as introduced, I agree that the King Amendment
- > makes essential improvements to a deeply flawed law and therefore
- > support its inclusion."
- >
- > Frank's new bill is being introduced at a time when The Interactive
- > Media Entertainment & Gaming Association, a trade organization
- > representing the Internet gaming interests, is in the midst of
- > challenging the UIGEA in the US 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals. iMEGA
- > recently brought on board Stephen A. Saltzburg, professor of law at
- > George Washington University, and one of Washington DC's most
- > accomplished attorneys.
- >
- > The introduction of Saltzburg is significant in that is a former deputy
- > assistant attorney general in the Criminal Division of the U.S.
- > Department of Justice, and chairman of the ABA Criminal Justice Section
- > from 2007 to 2008.
- >
- > "We always had a strong team representing us," said Joe Brennan, Jr.,
- > founder of iMEGA. "The addition of Prof. Saltzburg to our line-up
- > demonstrates that iMEGA is serious about meeting the US Department of
- > Justice on equal terms in court, and that we have strong advocates
- > making a compelling argument as to why the court should overturn this
- > troubling law."
- >
- > Brennan, Jr. has warned that - while Barney Frank is an important ally
- > to the online gambling industry - The US Justice Department has no plans
- > to sit around and wait for a bunch of politicians to fumble around
- > Congress then next three years. The big fear right now is that the US
- > Government has its eyes on the so-called "super affiliates" - those who
- > act as "partners and facilitators" within the United States on behalf of
- > Internet gambling businesses operating offshore, receiving a revenue cut.
- >
- > "Rather than just be another voice in the crowd, we're focusing our
- > resources on our litigation instead of lobbying," Brennan, Jr. stated.
- >
- > iMEGA has growing support within the online gambling industry, through

- > Brennan, Jr. admits there is still much more work to get accomplished.
- >
- > "Right now these online gambling affiliates are at the highest risk,"
- > Brennan, Jr. contends.
- >
- > The US Government has, in the past, subpoenaed some affiliates and a
- > public relations firm with ties to BetonSports.com, once the largest
- > sports betting company operating offshore.
- >
- > ----
- >
- > Christopher Costigan, Gambling911.com Publisher